

TABLE 1.—ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN MEMBERS AND DELEGATES IN THE 58TH–107TH CONGRESSES (1903–2003)—Continued

	Congress	Dates	House	Senate
104th	1995–1997	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Jay C. Kim Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta ⁴ Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.
105th	1997–1999	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Jay C. Kim Robert Takeo Matsui Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.
106th	1999–2001	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Robert Takeo Matsui Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.
107th	2001–2003	David Wu Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Michael M. Honda Robert Takeo Matsui Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood David Wu	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.

¹ Del. Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaʻole died on January 7, 1922.

² Del. Fofa Iosefa Fiti Sunia resigned on September 6, 1988.

³ Senator Daniel Kahikina Akaka also served in the House in the 101st Congress until May 15, 1990. However, he appointed was to the Senate and was sworn on May 16, 1990, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Spark Masayuki Matsunaga on April 15, 1990. Subsequently, he was elected to the Senate in November 1990.

⁴ Rep. Norman Yoshio Mineta resigned on October 10, 1995.

TABLE 4.—RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 60th–79th CONGRESSES (1907–1946)

Congress	Dates	Resident commissioners
60th	1907–1909	Benito Y Tuason Legarda. ¹ Pablo Ocampo. ¹
61st	1909–1911	Benito Y Tuason Legarda. ¹ Pablo Ocampo. ¹
62nd	1911–1913	Manuel Luis Quezon. ³ Benito Y Tuason Legarda.
63rd	1913–1915	Manuel Luis Quezon. Manuel Luis Quezon.
64th	1915–1917	Manuel Earnshaw. Manuel Luis Quezon. ⁴
65th	1917–1919	Manuel Earnshaw. Jaime Carlos de Veyra. Teodoro Rafael Yangco.
66th	1919–1921	Jaime Carlos de Veyra. Teodoro Rafael Yangco. ⁵ Isauro Gabaldon. ⁶
67th	1921–1923	Jaime Carlos de Veyra. Isauro Gabaldon.
68th	1923–1925	Isauro Gabaldon. Pedro Guevara.
69th	1925–1927	Isauro Gabaldon. Pedro Guevara.
70th	1927–1929	Isauro Gabaldon. ⁷ Pedro Guevara.
71st	1929–1931	Pedro Guevara. Camilo Osias.
72nd	1931–1933	Pedro Guevara. Camilo Osias.
73rd	1933–1935	Pedro Guevara. Camilo Osias.
74th	1935–1937	Pedro Guevara. ⁸ Francisco Afan Delgado. ⁸ Quintin Paredes. ⁹ Quintin Paredes. ¹⁰
75th	1937–1939	Joaquin Miguel Elizalde. ¹¹ Joaquin Miguel Elizalde.
76th	1939–1941	Joaquin Miguel Elizalde.
77th	1941–1943	Joaquin Miguel Elizalde.
78th	1943–1945	Joaquin Miguel Elizalde. ¹² Carlos Pena Romulo. ¹³ Carlos Pena Romulo. ¹⁴
79th	1945–1947	

¹ Elected November 22, 1907, for a term of two years, granted the privileges of the floor of the House of Representatives, with the right of debate, February 4, 1908.

² Term expired November 22, 1909.

³ Elected for a term of two years beginning November 23, 1909.

⁴ Resigned October 15, 1916, vacancy throughout the remainder of 64th Congress.

⁵ Term expired March 3, 1920.

⁶ Elected for a term of three years beginning March 4, 1920.

⁷ Resigned July 16, 1928, having been nominated for election to the Philippine House of Representatives, vacancy throughout the remainder of the 70th Congress.

⁸ When the new government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands was inaugurated, the terms of office of the Resident Commissioners of the Philippine Islands expired. Both resident Commissioners served until February 14, 1936, when a selected successor qualified (48 Stat. 456). Under this law, the number of Resident Commissioners was reduced from two to one.

⁹ Appointed December 21, 1935, to fill vacancy caused by the expiration of the terms of Pedro Guevara and Francisco A. Delgado, due to the new form of government, and took his seat on February 14, 1936.

¹⁰ Resigned September 29, 1938.

¹¹ Appointed September 29, 1938, to fill vacancy caused by resignation of Quintin Paredes; service began on January 3, 1939, upon convening of 76th Congress.

¹² Resigned August 9, 1944.

¹³ Appointed to fill vacancy caused by the resignation of Joaquin M. Elizalde, and succeeded him on August 21, 1944.

¹⁴ Office of Resident Commissioner terminated on July 4, 1946.

Note.—The Philippine Islands were part of territory ceded to the United States by Spain under the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898. The Act of July 1902 granted the Philippine Islands the right to elect two Resident Commissioners to the United States. In 1935, the Philippine Islands became the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the number of Resident Commissioners was reduced from two to one. In 1946, the Philippines became fully independent, and the office of the Resident Commissioner was terminated.

ARSENIC LEVELS IN DRINKING WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, like my distinguished colleague from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), this Member comes to the floor to urge his colleagues to look at the facts when it comes to the issue of arsenic in drinking water. The Bush administration's recent actions on this matter have led to heated rhetoric, wild exaggerations and soundbite politics.

I suppose that was predictable, since the word "arsenic" is so emotion-loaded. It is important, I believe, to get the full story and to listen to those who would be most affected by the proposed changes.

Many State and local officials, as well as water system administrators, have expressed concerns about the problems which could be caused by the proposed changes. This Member would begin by firmly stating that, of course, everyone recognizes the importance of providing safe drinking water for all of our Nation's citizens. Also some changes in the arsenic standard may well be justified. However, it makes no sense to base those changes on anything like emotion. Instead, they should be based on sound science.

As many of us know now, in the final days of the Clinton administration, a final rule was rushed through which would have reduced the acceptable

level of arsenic in drinking water from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion. However, new EPA administrator, Christie Todd Whitman, later announced that the agency would seek a scientific review of the standard before implementing a new rule. The Bush administration has made it clear that the arsenic level will be significantly reduced. However, it wants the final rule to be based on sound science.

It certainly appears that the Clinton administration made an arbitrary decision based upon questionable studies, most of which involve populations in other countries which were exposed to significantly higher levels of arsenic than those found in the United States. On the other hand, the EPA seems to dismiss the most comprehensive U.S. study on this matter. A 1999 study in Utah, which involved more than 5,000 people, failed to find an increased incidence of cancer associated with arsenic in drinking water.

It is certainly not the intent of this Member to treat lightly the possible adverse health effects of arsenic. However, this Member believes that accurate and relevant studies should be reviewed before water systems, especially those with limited resources, are forced to make such substantial investments in infrastructure and treatment. Smaller communities would have been especially hard hit by the implementation of the proposed arsenic level.

Arsenic levels in York, Nebraska, my birthplace, for example, a community of about 7,500 people, are at 34 parts per billion, and the initial cost to meet the new standard would be \$6 million. Gering, Nebraska, with a level of only 13 parts per billion, only 3 points over the arbitrary level set by the rule, would be compelled to spend about \$4.4 million.

Overall, more than 3,000 community water systems in the United States would have to come into compliance,

and the rule would have more than tripled water rates in many small communities.

Now, this Member believes that communities will be willing to spend the money necessary to address this matter if they were convinced that they would see actual health benefits by making the changes.

According to an April 14, 2001 article in the New York Times, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Mayor Jim Baca, a Democrat stated, "What we would like is some definitive scientific evidence that this would be worth doing. I am a pretty strong environmentalist but I was convinced that the data did not justify the new level."

It is important to listen to utility superintendents, city administrators, village boards, mayors and other local and State officials, including public health officials, who are concerned about the effect the proposed rule and its associated costs would have on their communities. These are people who have a powerful incentive to provide safe drinking water, since they and their constituents will be drinking that water. These community leaders know where the buck stops. They certainly would not subject themselves and their families and friends to harmful water. Quite simply, these local officials have not been convinced of the need to lower the arsenic to the level proposed by the Clinton administration.

It is also helpful to note that any community in the country now has the authority to lower arsenic in its drinking water to whatever level it chooses below 50 parts per billion. The reason communities have not lowered their levels to 10 parts per billion is that the health benefits have not been shown to justify the enormous cost.

The American Water Works Association stated in its comment last year, "At the level of 10 ppb or lower, the health risk reduction benefits become vanishingly small as compared to the costs."

The costs, however, are real. The American Water Works Association, which supports a reduction in the current arsenic standard, has estimated the proposed rule would cost \$600 million annually and require \$5 billion in capital outlays. In an ideal world, with unlimited resources, it may make sense to propose changes in the hope that they may provide a benefit. However, the reality is that communities do not have unlimited funds.

Everyone deserves safe drinking water and this Member urges his colleagues to listen to State and local officials on how to provide it.

THE NECESSITY OF THE HOUSE TO BALANCE ITS PRIORITIES AND MOVE FORWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning I wish to address the necessity for this House to balance its priorities and to begin to move forward its legislative agenda. Before I do that, let me associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) and thank him for bringing to the floor and dropping today legislation that will allow the printing of a book honoring Asian Pacific Islander Americans in Congress, particularly as we celebrate the history of our Asian American friends. This is a diverse country and we reflect the wonderfulness of that diversity.

As we do that as well, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am disturbed and concerned. Today we will rush to judgment, having missed two pages of the budget last week and having to delay it until Tuesday, to support a budget resolution that includes an enormous tax cut but fails to include \$294 billion for what we have all come to know as a very important issue, and that is the education of our children. With this budget, we know that we will be invading the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds by the year 2011.

I would have hoped that we would have been more timely with this budget, giving us more time to debate it and focusing on issues like making sure that uninsured children and uninsured Americans have health care, providing prescription drug coverage the way it should be, and including the \$294 billion for our educational needs, collaborating with our local governments and local school boards.

Tragically, another violent act at school occurred in an Alaska elementary school. This is Children's Mental Health Month and I am delighted to be able to focus on the need for mental health services for all of Americans, but as well to focus on the needs of our children. I would like to see more in-school health clinics for our children to be able to access services for both their physical health needs, immunizations, but as well, their mental health needs.

I believe that as we move forward to address the question of our foreign authorization bill, we will need to seriously debate the question of the loss of the United States' seat on the Human Rights Council in the United Nations. Many of my colleagues will rise in distress and anger, saying that we should no longer be associated with the United Nations. We should be cautious, and certainly we should be understanding of the fact that the United Nations now stands as the only entity where so many countries of so many diverse and disparate viewpoints actually can talk to each other.

Even though it is a very disturbing act to have lost the seat, we too have

to look at the policy of the United States as it relates to the nonpayment of its dues and its actions over the last couple of months that suggest that its world associates are unhappy, but we must not step away from fighting for human rights and we must insist that human rights becomes the call of the day for all nations, including China and Sudan and many others.

I want to thank and congratulate Senator Ellis and Representative Thompson of the State of Texas for getting through the Senate and the House a hate crimes legislative initiative, and I raise that point because it is long overdue for the United States of America's Congress to pass real hate crimes legislation to say and make a statement to those who would do heinous acts on the basis of someone's difference that we will not tolerate that in America. It still goes on in Texas. It still goes on in States across this Nation, and I think that we are long overdue for getting hate crime legislation to the floor.

We do understand that there has been movement in the Cincinnati occurrences, the tragedy of having had 15 African American males shot by the police since 1995. I think it is important that the Attorney General has now indicated that there will be a civil rights investigation, do it expeditiously and quickly, and begin to heal and solve those problems by insisting that the police department and the community work closely together.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker, there are several enormously important issues that we are dealing with as it relates to the energy crisis. We are not doing enough in this Congress. We are not doing enough in the administration by simply saying, handle it yourself; it is not going to go away. I believe it is time to help Americans with gasoline prices. I believe it is time to be able to provide dollars for those who will be overheated in the summer. With more additional funding for LIHEAP dollars in the State of Texas in 1998 and 1999, we lost 130-plus citizens because of the heat and not being able to provide the dollars they needed for utility costs or even having air-conditioners. I think certainly we should be helping with the brownouts. Conservation is important. Exploration is important within reason, but we must have emergency relief now for those who are experiencing the energy crisis, because it is here.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can focus on a lot of priorities and we are not doing so. Even as we watch the various layoffs of individuals across this Nation, they are asking for the Congress to act. Do not look at the layoffs and ignore them and say it is not in my State, just like we should not look at the energy crisis and ignore it and say it is not in my State. I believe we have priorities. We should act on them.